

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 1:02-CR-73-04

Plaintiff,

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

v.

TIMOTHY LAMONT PRICE,

ORDER

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Timothy Lamont Price's *pro se* Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's December 9, 2002 Judgment, which Defendant entitles "Motion to Challenge Courts [sic] Jurisdiction." Pursuant to Western District of Michigan Local Criminal Rule 47.3(a), reconsideration is appropriate only when the movant "demonstrate[s] a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties have been misled . . . [and] that a different disposition must result from the correction thereof." Since Defendant is proceeding *pro se*, the Court reviews the Motion consistent with the indulgent standards accorded *pro se* filers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Defendant challenges the Court's jurisdiction to enter the underlying Judgment by arguing that the bank he robbed was not FDIC insured. Upon review of this claim, no palpable error has been shown nor has it been shown that a different disposition should result. Simply put, the previous Judgment remains a proper disposition of the case for the reasons explained therein.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Timothy Lamont Price's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 153) is **DENIED**.

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:
May 2, 2008

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen
RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE